

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

HERU SPENCER and
DJEDI ORDER d/b/a
THE CHURCH OF PRISMATIC LIGHT,

Plaintiffs,

v.

THE CHURCH OF PRISMATIC LIGHT,
TIFFANY FAITH WAIT,
KATRINA ROSE WOLFF, JERI CLARK,
and IDA HAMILTON,

Defendants.

ORDER

22-cv-257-wmc

In a previous text-only order, I directed the clerk of court to seal Spencer's motion for a protective order, response briefs, and exhibits at defendant Tiffany Wait's request because these filings disclosed sensitive personal information about Wait and her family. Now, Wait asks the court to seal another response from Spencer (dkt. 110) because it allegedly contains false allegations. This, however, is not reason enough to seal a court document from public view. What happens in federal courts is presumptively open to the public because the public funds the courts and therefore "has an interest in what goes on at all stages of a judicial proceeding." *Citizens First Nat'l Bank of Princeton v. Cincinnati Ins. Co.*, 178 F.3d 943, 945 (7th Cir. 1999). This means that the court does not have *carte blanche* to seal whatever portions of the record a party wants to seal.

I am denying Wait's request to seal the response at docket no. 110 because neither it nor its attachments contain sensitive personal information about Wait and her family. However, I will direct the clerk of court to seal Spencer's replies at docket nos. 116 and 117 because the *attachments* do. The presiding judge will address the parties' remaining motions once they are all fully briefed and under advisement with the court.

ORDER

It is ORDERED that:

- (1) Defendant Tiffany Wait's request to seal docket no. 110 (dkt. 112) is DENIED.
- (2) The clerk of court is directed to seal docket nos. 116 and 117.

Entered this 6th day of November, 2023.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER
Magistrate Judge